



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 13TH, 1854.

LIEUT.-COL. LARCOM, F. R. S., VICE-PRESIDENT,
in the Chair.

THE Secretary read a paper by the Rev. Edward Hincks, D. D., on the Chronology of the Twenty-sixth Egyptian Dynasty, and of the commencement of the Twenty-seventh :—

The paper is first occupied with the period between the last year of Amasis and the first of Darius. Previous to the author's paper on the Egyptian Stèle (read on the 28th of June, 1841), all modern writers on the subject estimated this interval at three or four years. In that paper he showed that it must have contained six years; in this estimate he has been followed by Lepsius and Bunsen; he now contends that the true interval was seven years. The arguments by which he was led to make it six were two: the first was the inscription on the Cosseir Road, in which (as he interpreted it) a person named is stated to have held office for six years of Cambyses, thirty-six of Darius, and twelve of Xerxes. It is not likely, however, that Cambyses would have appointed a person to office in a remote district till some time after his conquest of Egypt; and before this the son of Amasis reigned six months, so that another year should probably be added. The other argument used in 1841 was the testimony of Africanus, whose text, unquestionably corrupt as it stands, could be made to express a consistent meaning by the single change of ε to θ; the uncial forms of which in MSS., shortly after the age of Africanus, are easily confounded. The meaning would be, according to this reading, "Cambyses reigned over his own kingdom of Persia nine years, and over Egypt six." The propriety of the entire reign in Persia being stated, as well as the portion of it during which he ruled Egypt, appears from the fact, recently discovered by Lepsius, that the years of Cam-

byses in Egyptian records are dated from the death of Cyrus. That the year which preceded the first of Darius was called the ninth of Cambyses appears from a stèle commemorating an Apis, the successor of the one who was killed by Cambyses. He was born in the fifth year of Cambyses, lived eight years, and died in the fourth year of Darius : which must, therefore, have been that which would have been the thirteenth of Cambyses. The difficulty arising from there being only eight years given to Cambyses in the Canon appears, at first sight, great; but the writer conceives that he has effectually removed it. It is proved from the Assyrian monuments, that what was called the first year of a king in Assyria and Babylonia was the year after that in which his predecessor died. On the other hand, Lepsius has shown that in Egypt, the year in which his predecessor died was counted as the first year of the new monarch. What was at its beginning the sixteenth of Necho II. became before its close the first of Psammitichus II. If, therefore, Cambyses succeeded Cyrus in the course of 530 b. c., the Egyptians would count the year 522, near the close of which he died, as his ninth year ; while the Babylonians would reckon it as only his eighth. The accession of the Magian is shown to have taken place about two months before the end of the Egyptian year ; and the next year would be the first of Darius, both in Egypt, because it was that in which he began to reign, and in Asia, because it was that which began next after the death of Cambyses. That Cambyses conquered Egypt in his third year, according to Egyptian computation —this being the year next following the forty-fourth of Amasis—has been proved by Lepsius ; but this year is, by what has just been proved, 528 b. c., or a. n. 220.

It follows from this that the first of Amasis was a. n. 176 ; of Apries, a. n. 157 ; of Psammitichus II., a. n. 151 ; of Necho II., a. n. 136 ; and of Psammitichus I., a. n. 82. Before him, Africanus and Eusebius agree as to the names of three kings, occupying twenty-one years : the names of whom, how-

ever, have not been found on the Egyptian monuments. It is first shown from Assyrian and Jewish synchronisms relating to the reigns of Shebek and Tirhaka, that an interval, not very different from what is assigned to these three reigns, must have elapsed between the reigns of Tirhaka and Psammitichus I. The omission of these names from the monuments is then attempted to be explained. It was first shown, by a genealogy of the Saite dynasty, that none of its kings, with the exception of the last, was descended from Queen Amenirtas, who, it was maintained, was the representative of the ancient Pharaohs. Five kings, however, in succession married into this family; the queen being, in three instances, half-sister to the king. By these marriages they strengthened their title to the crown, which otherwise was only possession by conquest. It was then argued that, as the Assyrian inscriptions spoke of "Kings of Egypt," as well as "the King of Meroe," Tirhaka, who, however, was monumentally "King of Upper and Lower Egypt;" and as the story of the dodecarchy, as given by Herodotus, must have had some foundation—though it was not correctly given—the following view was likely to be a correct one:—A dodecarchy of Egyptian chiefs (*hiks*) existed under the Ethiopian monarchs. On the death of Tirhaka some of them, including Stephinates, the dodecarch of Sais, assumed royal titles; subsequently *Amenirtas*, the "Ammeris, the Ethiopian" of Eusebius, who was probably a daughter of Tirhaka, claimed supreme authority over these dodecarchs, and established it to a great extent. The termination of the dodecarchy, by Psammitichus obtaining the sole power, may have happened in some such way as Herodotus describes; this, however, could not have been previous to his fifty-four years' reign, as Herodotus states. He ruled, from his father's death, as dodecarch and king, only fifty-four years in all. If this view be a correct one, it is not necessary to suppose that any monuments of any Saite prince before Psammitichus I. existed. Dr. Hincks, however, supposes that a stèle in the Louvre, in which

a king is represented whose prænomen is *Ra-men-kheper*—the name having been hammered out—commemorated Stephinates, and that it was defaced by order of Queen Amenirtas. He thinks, also, that the name Stephinates was a Greek corruption of *Tuf-Net*, “Neith is his breath:” which, he contends, was the proper pronunciation of the name of a person of whom there are naophorous statues at London and Paris; as there are of two of his sons at London and Rome, and of a grandson at London. From the inscriptions on these five statues, he concludes that this person must have been born in the latter part of the reign of Psammitichus I.: which would allow of his grandfather, from whom he inherited his name, being born under Stephinates.

The Secretary also read a paper, by the same author, on Assyrian Mythology.

This paper contains an enumeration of the Assyrian deities in the order in which their names occur on the obelisk in the Museum. The above gods are first mentioned, and, in connexion with them, some of their principal attributes, and certain mystic numbers annexed to their names on a tablet in the British Museum. They are—*Assur*, king of the gods, who has no number; *Anu*, 60; *Bil*, 50; the sea-god, whose name is supposed to be *Dagan*, 40; *Tsin*, 30; *Bin*, 6; *Shamas*, the sun, 20; *Marduk* (lost); *Bar*, “the son of the god, 50,” the principal war-god (lost); another war-god, supposed to be *Nirgal*, 12; and *Nabiu*, 10. The goddesses are then considered, about whom there is a difficulty. Three goddesses are mentioned in the Khorsabad inscriptions as holding the chief rank; though “the great wives” of several gods are mentioned also, who must be different from them. The two first of these are alone mentioned on the obelisk; while the tablet containing the numbers gives the third only, connecting her with the number 15. Her monogram is  On a cylinder of Esarhaddon in the Museum two goddesses are mentioned: